IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PIUS C.KURIAKOSE

WEDNESDAY, THE 6TH DECEMBER 2006 / 15TH AGRAHAYANA 1928

RP.No. 1065 of 2006(K)

REVIEW PETITIONER:

THE SECRETARY,
THRISSUR CORPORATION, THRISSUR.

BY ADV. SRI.K.P.VIJAYAN

RESPONDENTS:
---

1. PARENTS TEACHERS ASSOCIATION,
AMRITA VIDYALAYAM, AYYANTHOLE,
THRISSUR, REP. BY ITS PRESIDENT, V. SANTHOSH KUMAR
S/O.PADMAVATHY, PULLATTIL HOUSE, PUTHURKKARA
DESOM, AYYANTHOLE VILLAGE, THIRSSUR TALUK.

2. K.A. JOSE, S/O.ANTONY, KARERAKATTIL
HOUSE, AYYANTHOLE P.O., THRISSUR.

3. M.N. GOPALAKRISHNAN, S/O.VELAYUDHAN,
MANKOTTATHIL HOUSE, AYYANTHOLE P.O.,
THRISSUR.

4. MATA AMRITANANDAMAYI MATH,
AMRITAPURI P.O., KOLLAM DISTRICT,
REP. BY ITS MONASTIC MEMBER SWAMY
TURIAMRITANANDA PURI.

BY ADV. SRI.P.VIJAYA BHANU
SMT.P.F.ROSY
BY A.F.SEBASTIAN
BY SRI.K.SREEKUMAR

THIS REVIEW PETITION HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 06/12/2006, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

PIUS C.KURIAKOSE, J.

R.P.NO. 1065 of 2006 IN W.P.(C) NO.15016/2006

Dated this 6th day of December 2006

O R D E R

The first respondent in the writ petition (the Corporation of Thrissur) seeks review of my judgment prominently on the ground that the judgment extinguishes all chances for settlement between the parties. It is urged that several conferences were held in the chamber of the Mayor of the review petitioner Corporation under aegis of the Corporation for bringing forth a settlement of the various issues related to road in question and the parties were approaching towards the amicable solution for all the issues. The draft agreement of settlement was already produced as Ext.R(i) along with the counter affidavit filed by the Corporation. Sri.K.P.Vijayan the learned Standing Counsel for the Corporation submitted that Ext.R(i) could not effectively brought to my notice when the writ petition was argued.

2. I am not persuaded on the submissions of Sri.Vijayan to admit this petition. I am of the view that there are no grounds

for review having regard to the contours of the jurisdiction. In Ext.R(i) the writ petitioner – Parents Teachers Association Amrita Vidyalaya is significantly not a party. When the attention of the learned counsel for the 4th respondent (school authority) was drawn to Ext.R(i), the response was lukewarm. According to the counsel, the 4th respondent was yet to sign Ext.R(i). The Review Petition accordingly will stand dismissed. There will be a direction to the Corporation to implement the directions in my judgment which is essentially concerned about the grievance voiced by the Parents Teachers Association the writ petitioenr at the earliest, at any rate within two months from today.

It is however made clear that neither the judgment nor the order in this review Petition will stand in the way of the Corporation persuading all the parties to come to a settlement which is acceptable to everybody.

PIUS C.KURIAKOSE
Judge

dpk